

Correct mutual information, quantum bit error rate and secure transmission efficiency in Wojcik's eavesdropping scheme on ping-pong protocol

Zhanjun Zhang

Wuhan Institute of Physics and Mathematics, The Chinese Academy of Sciences, Wuhan 430071, China

E-mail: Zhangzj@wipm.ac.cn

(Dated: February 1, 2008)

Recently Wójcik has analyzed the security of the 'ping-pong' quantum communication protocol[1] in the case of considerable quantum channel losses and accordingly an undetectable eavesdropping scheme and possible improvements on the 'ping-pong' protocol are proposed [2]. This is true. However, in his paper, there exist some mistakes, i.e., the mutual information I , quantum bit error rate (QBER) and secure transmission efficiency are incorrect. In this paper, I would like to point out them and correct them.

First, I would like to present a simple question and an obvious fact:

(a) In Wojcik's paper, Bob's QBER (quantum bits error rate) is precisely $1/4$. Then one would like to ask how many wrong bits in Bob's bits provided that the total bit number N is odd or $2n+2$. Assuming $N=201, 202, 203$, whether the corresponding answers are 50.25, 50.50, 50.75 respectively? If so, how ridiculous they are for the numbers of the wrong bits are noninteger. It is the wrong QBER= $1/4$ that leads to the ridiculous results.

(b) According to Wojcik's figure 4, one can find when the channel transmission efficiency is zero, both Eve and Bob still can get informations from Alice and Eve's is larger than Bob's. This is like that, when I call you and speak aloud for a quite long time disregarding the status of the phone, although the phoneline is cutted at the very beginning, you still can get some information from me. Another ridiculous result!

All these have obviously shown that there are mistakes in Wojcik's paper.

I strongly suspect Wojcik's conclusion (i.e., Eve's mutual information with Alice's is not decreased for she exactly knows whether the symmetry operation is performed or not, while Bob's mutual information with Alice's is decreased for he does not know whether the symmetry operation is performed. Alternatively, in Wojcik's original words, 'It should be emphasized that symmetrization disturbs the communication between Alice and Bob in such a way that mutual information is reduced while the QBER is not affected'). Here I offer a verification of my suspicion via simple examples. Additionally, in these examples the doubtful QBER= $1/4$ question can also be addressed.

Let 'u' denote Eve's attack without the symmetry operation and 's' be Eve's attack with the symmetry operation. Suppose Alice's bit be '1001'. If Bob gets '1000' after his measurements, one can easily work out the mutual information between Bob and Alice $I_{AB} = 0.311$ and Bob's QBER= $1/4$. The calculations are completely determined by Bob's bits and Alice's bits disregarding the intermediate process by Eve. In fact, after any one of the 'uuuu', 'susu', 'ssuu' or 'ussu' attacks by Eve, it is possible for Bob to get '1000'. So one can easily find that after the symmetry

operations (e.g., 'susu', 'ssuu' and 'ussu') the mutual information between Bob and Alice is not reduced at all. This indicates that Wojcik's corresponding conclusion is wrong. Although the QBER in the above example is $1/4$, in fact, Bob's QBER is not always $1/4$ at all. This can be seen from the following example. Also suppose Alice's bits be '1001'. It is possible for Bob to get '1001' after any one of the 'uuuu', 'ssss', 'suus', 'susu', 'ssuu', 'usus', 'ussu' or 'uuss' attacks by Eve. In any one of these cases, the $I_{AB} = 1$ while the QBER=0. This example also verifies that Wojcik's conclusion is wrong. In fact, it is possible for Bob to get different bits after his measurements. Generally speaking, different bits correspond to different mutual information and different QBER. This conclusion is different from Wojcik's given mutual information and given QBER.

I would like to say the essential reason which leads to Wojcik's is the inappropriate use of the mutual information. He has made a confusion of the mutual information of single-bit-gain and the mutual information of multi-bits-gain. Also he should notice in reality the number of Alice's bits is finite.

As for discussions on the secure transmission efficiency, one can also see my manuscript quant-ph-0402022.

In Wojcik's paper, according to the analysis on the mutual information I as a function of the transmission efficiency η of the quantum channel, Wójcik concludes that the 'ping-pong' protocol is not secure for $\eta < 60\%$. Here I would like to point out that this conclusion is not reliable.

The mutual information in Wojcik's paper is only and essentially a single-time- statistic mutual information. This physical quantity is used inappropriately in Wojcik's paper to stand for the mutual information of the whole transmissions (multi times), alternatively, the mutual informations of the whole transmissions (multi times) are not worked out appropriately (It is not suitable to calculate the mutual informations by using the so-called joint probability distributions as the equation 7 in Wójcik's paper). Since the number N of Alice's transmitted bits is finite in reality, generally speaking, after the whole transmissions, it is quite possible that APD (probability distributions which can be and should be extracted from all the Alice's, Bob's and Eve's bits) are different from SPD (probability distributions suitable for the single bit gain). The larger N , the more possibly APD are close to SPD. Only when N is infinite, APD are equal to SPD.

Consider the case that $\eta \leq 50\%$ (i.e., Eve can attack all the bits). Suppose Alice's transmitted and attacked bits be '1011000101...'. When Alice sends the first bit '1', according to Wójcik's scheme, it is *possible* for Bob to get '1' and for Eve to get '0' by measurements. Also it is *possible* for Bob to get '0' and for Eve to get '1'. Certainly there are other possibilities. Similar results occur for other transmitted bits. So after Alice transmits the bits one by one, it is *possible* for Bob to get '1011000101...'. This means that it is *possible* for Bob to get same bits with Alice's provided that N is finite (In reality N should be finite). This denies Wójcik's conclusion that I_{AE} is *always* bigger than I_{AB} when $\eta \leq 50\%$ (cf. figure 4 in Wójcik's paper). Additionally, it is unimaginable that according to the figure 4 both I_{AE} and I_{AB} are nonzero and $I_{AE} > I_{AB}$ when $\eta = 0$. Of course, similarly, it is also *possible* for Eve to get the same bits with Alice's when N is finite. In the case that N is infinite $I_{AE} = I_{AB}$ can be arrived at. All these mean that the ping-pong protocol is really not secure when $\eta \leq 50\%$. Still in the case that N is infinite, when η is larger than 50%, then only a fraction of all the transmitted bits can be attacked by Eve

and accordingly $I_{AB} > I_{AE}$. The forking point is $\eta = 50\%$. This means that the corresponding conclusion in Wójcik's paper is wrong. In reality N should be finite. In this case, for all the attacked bits, it is *possible* for Eve to get the same ones with Alice's. Therefore, if a condition that the number of the Bob's correct bits is not less than the number of Eve's correct bits is required, it is easy to work out that η should be not less than 75%. This means that in reality the ping-pong protocol is not secure for $\eta \leq 75\%$.

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant Nos. 10304022.

[1] K. Boström and T. Felbinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 187902(2002).

[2] Antoni Wójcik, Phys. Rev. Lett., **90**, 157901(2003).